

Appl. No. 10/740,261
Atty. Docket No. 9475
Reply dated March 8, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 10, 2005
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for his time during a telephone interview on March 1, 2006 with Applicants' representative, C. Brant Cook. During the telephone interview, the prior art reference was discussed.

Claim 1 has been amended to define the claimed invention with greater specificity by emphasizing that the short cellulosic fibers and the synthetic fibers are disposed in the layer in a non-random pattern. Support for this amendment is found in the Specification, especially at page 5, lines 13-23.

New Claims 21 and 22 have been added. Support for these new claims is found throughout the Specification, Drawings and Claims as originally filed.

Applicants acknowledge the withdrawal of the objections to the Specification and the Claims.

Claims 1-6 and 8-15 and 17-22 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Rejection Under 35 USC §102(b) Over U.S. 5,538,595

Claims 1, 5-6 and 17-20 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly defining obvious subject matter over U.S. Patent No. 5,538,595 to Trokhan et al. ("Trokhan"). The Examiner asserts that Trokhan discloses a fibrous structure comprising at least two layers wherein at least one of the layers of the structure includes long cellulosic fibers and at least one of the layers includes short cellulosic fibers. The Examiner further asserts that Trokhan discloses that synthetic fibers may be utilized in combination with the cellulosic fibers. Further, the Examiner asserts that Trokhan discloses that its structure may be subjected to pattern densification wherein the structure is characterized by having a relatively high bulk field of relatively low fiber density and an array of densified zones of relatively high fiber density. As a result of the pattern densification, the Examiner concludes that Trokhan discloses that at least one of its layers may form a non-random pattern and have regions of different basis weight.

Appl. No. 10/740,261
Atty. Docket No. 9475
Reply dated March 8, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 10, 2005
Customer No. 27752

During the telephone interview with the Examiner, Applicants' representative, C. Brant Cook, explained to the Examiner that Trokhan fails to teach that its short cellulosic fibers and synthetic fibers are disposed in a layer in a non-random pattern. In other words, Trokhan fails to teach a structure comprising a layer having short cellulosic fibers and synthetic fibers that are arranged within the layer in a non-random pattern. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by nor rendered obvious over Trokhan. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 2-6, 8-15 and 17-20, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, as amended, are not anticipated by nor rendered obvious over Trokhan.

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over U.S. 5,538,595 in view of U.S. 5,516,580

Claims 2-3 and 8 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly defining obvious subject matter over Trokhan, discussed above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,516,580 to Frenette et al. ("Frenette").

Applicants respectfully submit that Trokhan alone or in combination with Frenette fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention as claimed in Claims 2-3 and 8, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, as amended, for the same reasons that Claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by nor rendered obvious over Trokhan.

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over U.S. 5,538,595 in view of WO 93/14267

Claims 4 and 9 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly defining obvious subject matter over Trokhan, discussed above, and further in view of WO 93/14267 to Manning ("Manning").

Applicants respectfully submit that Trokhan alone or in combination with Manning fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention as claimed in Claims 4 and 9, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, as amended, for the same reasons that Claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by nor rendered obvious over Trokhan.

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over U.S. 5,538,595 in view of U.S. 4,202,959

Claim 10 is rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly defining obvious subject matter over Trokhan, discussed above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,202,959 to Henbest et al. ("Henbest").

Appl. No. 10/740,261
Atty. Docket No. 9475
Reply dated March 8, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 10, 2005
Customer No. 27752

Applicants respectfully submit that Trokhan alone or in combination with Henbest fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention as claimed in Claim 10, which ultimately depends from Claim 1, as amended, for the same reasons that Claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by nor rendered obvious over Trokhan.

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over U.S. 5,538,595 in view of
U.S. 5,516,580 or WO 93/14267

Claims 10-12 and 15 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly defining obvious subject matter Trokhan, discussed above, and further in view of any one of Frenette and Manning, both discussed above.

Applicants respectfully submit that Trokhan alone or in combination with Frenette and/or Manning fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention as claimed in Claims 10-12 and 15, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, as amended, for the same reasons that Claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by nor rendered obvious over Trokhan.

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over U.S. 5,538,595 in view of
U.S. 5,405,499 or U.S. 5,409,572

Claims 13-14 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly defining obvious subject matter over Trokhan, discussed above, and further in view of any one of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,405,499 to Vinson ("Vinson") or 5,409,572 to Kershaw et al. ("Kershaw").

Applicants respectfully submit that Trokhan alone or in combination with Vinson and/or Kershaw fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention as claimed in Claims 13-14, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, as amended, for the same reasons that Claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by nor rendered obvious over Trokhan.

New Claims 21 and 22

Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 21 and 22, which depend from Claim 1, as amended, are not anticipated by nor rendered obvious over the cited prior art references for the same reasons that Claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by nor rendered obvious over the cited prior art references, especially Trokhan.

Appl. No. 10/740,261
Atty. Docket No. 9475
Reply dated March 8, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 10, 2005
Customer No. 27752

Conclusion

This response represents an earnest effort to place the application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as now claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the rejections, and allowance of Claim 1, as amended, and Claims 2-6, 8-15 and 17-22, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By C. Brant Cook
Signature

Date: March 8, 2006
Customer No. 27752

C. Brant Cook
Typed or Printed Name
Registration No. 39,151
(513) 634-1533